Remarks

Reconsideration is requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks. Claim 26 is canceled without prejudice, and new claims 27-37 are submitted for consideration. Support for new claims 27-37 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 19-28. No new matter is introduced. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 and 27-37 are in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-14 stand rejected as anticipated by Zillikens, U.S. Patent 6,813,503 ("Zillikens"). This rejection is traversed. The rejection is noted as being under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Zillikens issued on November 2, 2004 and the subject application was filed on December 12, 2001 so that Zillikens cannot be prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). A PCT patent application corresponding to Zillikens appears to have published as PCT Patent Publication WO01/19102 on March 15, 2001, and thus also fails to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, this rejection is discussed herein with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 102 generally, and clarification is requested.

Claim 1 recites a communication device that comprises a register configured to store a user identifier and a transmitter configured to transmit the user identifier to a network. Zillikens does not teach or suggest such a communication device. According to the Office action, Zillikens teaches a user identifier:

> The identifier is used to identify content at the address provided by the server, wherein the server is accessed by sending the identifier to the linking means to identify which type of content is requested at the server. Zillikens, col. 8, lines 52-53.

However, while Zillikens teaches an identifier, the identifier of Zillikens is a <u>content</u> identifier

that identifies the requested content. In contrast, claim 1 recites a <u>user</u> identifier that identifies a

user who may be, for example, requesting particular content or for whom content may be

selected based on the user identity. Because Zillikens does not teach or suggest a user identifier,

claim 1, dependent claims 2-6, and new dependent claims 27-34 are properly allowable over

Zillikens.

Claim 7 recites a cell phone that includes a subscriber identity module (SIM) that

includes a user identifier and a transmitter configured to transmit the user identifier. Zillikens at

col. 8, lines 46-64 is cited as teaching a SIM module that includes a user identifier. This is

incorrect. As noted above, this portion of Zillikens teaches a <u>content</u> identifier that identifies

requested content, and does not teach or suggest a user identifier. For at least this reason, claim

7 and dependent claims 8-9 are properly allowable over Zillikens.

Claim 10 recites a content provider configured to communicate with one or more mobile

stations. The content provider includes a content personalization interface configured to receive

an anonymous user identifier from at least one of the mobile stations. Zillikens does not teach or

suggest such a content provider. Col. 3, lines 13-29 of Zillikens is cited as teaching an

anonymous user identifier:

> A user interface is connected to the browser application having display means for
> displaying content received from the server and user input means provides an
> input to the browser application. The input comprises a query of location
> information, which is independent of the position of the terminal, wherein the
> input is provided in the request, and arranged to receive content comprising an
> indication of the location information from said server by means of the location
> means.
>   Hence, the invention provides a request from a wireless communication
> terminal, like a cellular phone, for accessing location information from a server
> comprising location information, which is independent of the position of the
> terminal. This means that the terminal sends a request to the server for receiving

an indication of location information, without revealing the position of the terminal upon sending the request to the server. Col. 3, lines 13-29.

Thus, Zillikens teaches providing an input that is independent of a terminal location but Zillikens does not mention any kind of user identifier, including an anonymous user identifier. For at least this reason, claim 10 and dependent claim 11 are properly allowable over Zillikens.

Claim 12 recites a subscriber identity module for a wireless network that comprises a memory configured to retain a SIM identifier, and a processor configured to supply the SIM identifier to a communication device. Zillikens does not teach or suggest such a SIM. As noted above, according to Zillikens, a content identifier can be transmitted to obtain requested content, but Zillikens does not teach or suggest transmitting a SIM identifier that identifies a particular SIM. For at least this reason, claim 12 and dependent claim 13 are properly allowable.

Claim 14 recites a content provider that comprises a personalization interface configured to receive anonymous personalization data and a processor configured to provide content to a user based on the anonymous personalization data. Zillikens is cited as teaching providing content to a user at col. 3, lines 13-29. This is incorrect. The cited portion of Zillikens teaches requesting location information from a content provider without necessarily providing location information for a particular terminal. Zillikens does not teach or such providing content to a user based on anonymous personalization data. For at least this reason, claim 14 and dependent claims 15-20 are properly allowable over Zillikens.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zillikens and Zalewski

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected in view of a combination of Zillikens and Zalewski et al., U.S. Patent 6,771,981 ("Zalewski"). This rejection is traversed. Claims 4 and 9 depend from

allowable claims 1 and 7, and are properly allowable for at least this reason. These claims are

also allowable for at least the additional reasons set forth below.

Claim 4 recites a communication device that comprises a transmitter and a subscriber

identity module (SIM), wherein a user identifier is associated with a serial number assigned to

the SIM and the transmitter is configured to transmit the user identifier. No combination of

Zillikens and Zalewski teaches or suggests a serial number assigned to the SIM, a user identifier

associated with the serial number, or a transmitter configured to transmit such a user identifier.

Instead, Zalewski teaches a personal identification number (PIN) that must be entered in order to

use a mobile phone, but Zalewski fails to teach or suggest a serial number assigned to the SIM,

or transmitter configured to transmit a user identifier associated with the serial number assigned

to the SIM. According to Zalewski,

> For using the mobile station, a PIN (Personal Identification Number) number
> saved on the SIM must be given, generally when the mobile phone is switched on.
> Col. 1, lines 50-55.

The PIN of Zalewski is used to permit access to the mobile phone, and is saved in SIM memory.

Zalewski's PIN is not a serial number assigned to the SIM, nor does Zalewski teach or suggest

transmitting the PIN as recited in claim 4. Thus, the combination of Zillikens and Zalewski fails

to teach or suggest all the features of claim 4, and claim 4 is properly allowable.

Claim 9 is allowable as dependent from allowable claim 7, and is properly allowable over

any combination of Zillikens and Zalewski for additional reasons as well. Claim 9 recites a cell

phone that comprises a subscriber identity module (SIM) that includes a user identifier

associated with a SIM serial number and a transmitter configured to transmit the user identifier.

No combination of Zillikens and Zalewski teaches or suggests such a cell phone. Zillikens does

not teach or suggest a user identifier associated with a serial number stored on the SIM.

Zalewski fails to cure the deficiencies of Zillikens. Zalewski teaches a personal identification

number (PIN) that is saved on a SIM and that must be supplied to a cell phone when the cell

phone is switched on. Col. 1, lines 50-53. Zalewski does not teach or suggest a transmitter that

is configured to transmit the PIN. In addition, Zalewski's PIN is not associated with a serial

number stored on the SIM, but instead is based on a PIN set by the user. For at least these

reasons, claim 9 is properly allowable over any combination of Zillikens and Zalewski.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zillikens and Olgaard

Claims 15-19, 21-23, and 25-26 stand rejected as obvious from a combination of

Zillikens and Olgaard et al., U.S. Patent 6,542,740 ("Olgaard"). This rejection is traversed. The

rejection of claim 26 is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 26 without prejudice.

Claims 15-19 are allowable as dependent from allowable claim 14, and are allowable

over any combination of Zillikens and Olgaard for additional reasons as well. For example,

claim 15 recites a content provider that comprises a personalization interface configured to

receive anonymous personalization data, and a processor configured to provide content to a user

based on the anonymous personalization data. A database is configured to store personalization

data. Olgaard is cited as teaching such a database at col. 4, lines 49-52:

> [T]he interface server 104 may also be connected to a data store/database 120 in
> which application data and configuration data relating to the various types of
> interface clients may be stored. Olgaard, col. 4, lines 49-52.

However, according to Olgaard, an interface client is an interface device: "Users utilize interface

devices ('interface clients') external to the actual communication engine." Olgaard, col. 3, lines

17-18. Olgaard's database is associated with devices, and does not contain anonymous

personalization data associated with users such as anonymous user identification as recited in

claim 15. Because neither Zillikens not Olgaard teaches or suggests a database configured to

store anonymous personalization data as recited in claim 15, claim 15 is properly allowable over

any combination of Zillikens and Olgaard.

As another example, claim 19 recites a content provider that comprises a personalization

interface is configured to receive a user identifier that is stored on a subscriber identification

module (SIM), and claim 20 further recites that the user identifier is a SIM serial number.

Olgaard is cited as teaching such a content provider at col. 11, lines 29-45:

> As previously mentioned, embodiments of the present invention may enable
> display roaming when an interface client already has a way to contact the
> infrastructure server without using (i.e., going through) the user's wireless link. In
> such an embodiment, the user may logon to the interface client to identify the
> user. Many different authentication schemes may be possible--one example could
> be a universal ID-card like a SIM card, and fingerprints identification (or
> identification by biometrics), or a User ID/password system. The wireless link
> may be used to perform the user identification or may include a SIM card therein
> for enabling the identification. However, in this embodiment, the wireless link
> does not have to serve as the communication link between the interface client and
> the infrastructure server. If the interface client does not offer a convenient input
> interface, the wireless link could also be used as the input device. Olgaard, col.
> 11, lines 29-45.

Olgaard merely teaches routine logon procedures wherein a user is required to identify himself to

a server. Such routine procedures do not provide anonymous user identification as recited in

these claims. In addition, Olgaard does not teach that a SIM serial number can service as a user

identifier. For at least these reasons clams 19-20 are properly allowable over any combination of

Zillikens and Olgaard.

Claim 21 recites a method of providing personalized content in a wireless communication

network, comprising selecting an anonymous user identifier and selecting content based on the

user identifier. Olgaard is cited as teaching an anonymous user identifier at col. 3, lines 15-64.

Olgaard teaches, in part,

> In an embodiment where the connection is made between an interface client and an application via a wireless link, a user carries a wireless link (such as, for example, a mobile phone-like device) and this wireless link creates a connection to the interface client near the user and creates a connection from the wireless link to the application or infrastructure server. . . . In a preferred embodiment, the wireless link may include personal identification information associated with the user and provide ways to encrypt the data to different extends, for example, from simple encryption to offering a wireless VPN connection.
>
> In an embodiment where a connection between an interface client and an infrastructure server is made using an existing link, the interface client is already connected (wired or wireless) directly to the infrastructure server without communication through the wireless link. . . . [U]ser-identification may be provided as part of the wireless link's own electronic identification, or any other usable identification method.

Olgaard teaches ordinary log on procedures in which a user identifies himself. Olgaard does not teach or suggest selecting anonymous user identifier as recited in claims 21, and claim 21 and dependent claims 22-24 are properly allowable over any combination of Zillikens and Olgaard.

Claim 25 as amended recites a method of obtaining anonymous personalized content, comprising selecting an anonymous user identifier based on a serial number assigned to a SIM, and identifying content for delivery based on the anonymous user identifier. No cited reference teaches a serial number assigned to a SIM or an anonymous user identifier based on a SIM serial number. For at least this reason, claim 25 is properly allowable.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Zillikens, Olgaard, and Zalewski

Claims 20 and 24 stand rejected as obvious in view of a combination of Zillikens, Olgaard, and Zalewski. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 24 depends from allowable claim 21, and is properly allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 20 depends from allowable claim 14 and is properly allowable for at least this

reason. In order to further note differences between the claimed subject matter and the cited

references, the features of claim 20 are discussed in further detail. Claim 20 recites a user

identifier that is a SIM serial number. Zalewski is cited as teaching a personal identification

number (PIN). However, Zalewski's PIN is not associated with a SIM serial number. A SIM

serial number is typically assigned by a SIM manufacture and is permanently associated with a

particular SIM. For at least this reason, claim 20 is properly allowable.

New claims 35-37

New claims 35-37 are directed to subscriber identity modules (SIM) that include memory

configured to store an anonymous user identity based on serial number of the SIM and at least

one of a mobile subscriber identity and a mobile station number. No cited reference or

combination of cited references teaches or suggest such SIMs.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, all pending claims are in condition

for allowance, and action to such end is requested. If any questions remain, the Examiner is

requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By

Michael D. Jones
Registration No. 41,879

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446